

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 28 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed September 28, 2005 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 64-74 were previously canceled. Claims 1-63 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 24, and 47 being the only independent claims. Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed on September 28, 2005, claims 1-2, 21-25, 44-45, 47-48, and 61-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0078058 (Vatanen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,668,875 (Brown).

Claims 3, 4, 9, 16, 26, 27, 32, 39, 49, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Vatanen in view Brown and in view of 3GPP Technical Specification 3G-TS-33.203, Access Security for IP-Based Services (3G-TS-33.203).

Claims 5-8, 28-31, 50 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Vatanen in view of Brown and 3G-TS-33.203 and further in view of 3GPP Technical Specification 3G-TS-33.102, Security Architecture (3G-TS-33.102).

Claims 10-15, 17-20, 33-38, 40-43, and 53-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Vatanen in view of Brown and 3G-TS-33.203 and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0103850 (Moyer).

Independent claim 1 recites "assigning a temporary identity index for the sender of the message at each of the user equipment and the network element including separately performing an algorithm at each of the user equipment and the network element for generating the temporary identity index using public information which identifies the sender of the message as an input to the algorithm" and "adding a header including the temporary identity index to the message to identify the sender of the message prior to transmission of the message".

Vatanen fails to disclose (1) assigning a temporary identity index and (2) separately performing an algorithm at each of the user equipment and the network element for generating the temporary identity index, as expressly recited in independent claim 1. The Examiner acknowledges in the Office Action that Vatanen fails to disclose "separately performing an algorithm at each of the user equipment and the network element for generating the temporary identity index". The Examiner also alleges that the MUI (Pidkey) disclosed by Vatanen reads on the temporary identity index. Vatanen discloses that an MUI (Pidkey) is generated and used in the header of a message (see paragraph 0019 and Fig. 1 of Vatanen). Paragraph 0021 of Vatanen disclose how to generate the MUI (Pidkey). However, there is no indication that the MUI (Pidkey) is a temporary identifier of the sender. Accordingly, Vatanen fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a temporary identity index.

Brown fails to teach or suggest what Vatanen lacks. The Examiner alleges that Brown discloses the generation of a temporary identity index at each of the user equipment and the network equipment at col. 2, lines 11-20 and 22-23 of Brown. However, Brown fails to teach or suggest "separately performing an algorithm at each of the user equipment and the network element for generating the temporary identity index", as recited in independent claim 1, because (1) Brown discloses that the SRES is a response to a challenge for authentication, and (2) the subscriber in Brown already has a temporary identification (i.e., TMSI) before the authentication process is initiated. The section of Brown referred to by the Examiner discloses that a fixed network communication unit initiates an authentication protocol after receiving a Temporary Mobile Subscriber Identity (TMSI) from a subscriber (see col. 2, lines 11-13, of Brown). The fixed network communication network unit then generates and sends a challenge (RAND) to the subscriber (col. 2, lines 14-15). The subscriber then generates a signed response (SRES) which

is compared to a network generated SRES (col. 2, lines 18-21). If the SRESs match, the subscriber is authenticated. Since the SRES is a response to an authentication challenge and because the subscriber already has a TMSI, Brown fails to disclose "separately performing an algorithm at each of the user equipment and the network element for generating the temporary identity index", as recited in independent claim 1. Brown further fails to disclose that the SRES generated in the network and the subscriber unit is a temporary identity index that is added to a header of a message as an identification of the sender of the message.

Even if the MUI (Pidkey) disclosed by Vatanen is considered to be a temporary identity index, which we do not believe to be true, the combined teaching of Vatanen and Brown still fail to teach or suggest that a temporary index is generated in both the user equipment and the network. As described above, the SRES in Brown is a response to an authentication challenge and not an identity of the subscriber. Furthermore, since Brown teaches that the user already has a TMSI, Brown teaches that the SRES is separate from the temporary identifier of the subscriber. Accordingly, the combined teachings of Vatanen and Brown fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations "separately performing an algorithm at each of the user equipment and the network element for generating the temporary identity index" and "adding a header including the temporary identity index to the message to identify the sender of the message prior to transmission of the message", as expressly recited in independent claim 1.

Independent claims 24 and 47 each include limitations similar to the above recited limitations which require that the temporary identity index that is used in a header of a message to identify the sender is generated separately by performing an algorithm at each of the user equipment and the network element. Accordingly, independent claims 24 and 47 are allowable for the same reasons as is independent claim 1.


Dependent claims 2-23, 25-46, and 48-63, each being dependent on one of independent claims 1, 24, and 47, are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons expressed above with respect to independent claims 1, 24, and 47.

Dependent claims 8 and 31 each further recite that the temporary identity index is stored in a memory in a visiting network. Vatanen fails to disclose this limitation because Vatanen discloses that the MUI Pidkey includes information identifying which public key to use to decrypt the message. Since the MUI Pidkey includes the information required to decrypt, a visiting network is not required to store the MUI Pidkey. As described above, Brown fails to disclose that a temporary identity index is generated at the user equipment and the network element. Accordingly, independent claims 8 and 31 are allowable over Vatanen in view of Brown for at least these additional reasons.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By 
Alfred W. Froeblich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: December 28, 2005